

### **REMARKS**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the *Office Action*. At the time of the *Office Action*, Claims 1, 3-9, 11 and 13-36 were pending and Claims 1, 3-9, 11, 13-20 and 31-36 were rejected. Claims 21-30 are withdrawn. Applicant has added Claim 37. As explained below, Applicant believes all claims to be allowable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

### **Section 103 Rejections**

The Examiner rejects Claims 1, 3-5, 9, 11, 13-15 and 33-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,125,390 issued to Touboul ("*Touboul*") and U.S. Patent No. 6,049,828 issued to Dev et al. ("*Dev*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,761,502 issued to Jacobs ("*Jacobs*"). The Examiner rejects Claims 6 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Touboul*, *Dev* and *Jacobs* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,011,838 to Cox ("*Cox*"). The Examiner rejects Claims 7 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Touboul*, *Dev* and *Jacobs* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,748,098 to Grace ("*Grace*"). The Examiner rejects Claims 8 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Touboul*, *Dev* and *Jacobs* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,006,016 to Faigon et al. ("*Faigon*"). The Examiner rejects Claims 19-20 and 31-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Touboul*, *Dev* and *Jacobs* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,933,601 to Fanshier ("*Fanshier*"). Applicant respectfully traverses those rejections.

**I.     *Dev* does not disclose, teach, or suggest “a user-generated text-based dialogue request specifying a user defined type of context data” as recited in Claim 1.**

Claim 1 includes the limitations, “receiving, in response to the reporting of the alert condition, a user-generated text-based dialogue **request specifying a user defined type of context data** for the subject system object.” To reject those limitations, the Examiner points to a list of alarms displayed in Figure 10 of *Dev* and argues that the

above-quoted limitations are taught by the act of “clicking on the condition red.” *Office Action*, page 3. However, *Dev* is completely devoid of any teaching that the alleged request “specif[ies] a user defined type of context data” as recited in Claim 1. Rather, *Dev* makes it clear that by clicking on a particular alarm, the user may generically obtain “more information.” *Dev*, col. 15, lines 16-18. The alleged request of *Dev* does not allow specification of the type of context data to be requested or the user to specify a user defined type of context data.

Although the Examiner alleges that the system of *Dev* enables a user to define the severity of the event (e.g., “Condition Red”); see *Office Action*, page 14, lines 18-19 - page 15, line 1 (citing *Dev*, col. 8, lines 11-14), Applicants respectfully point out that this is a mischaracterization of *Dev*. According to the portion of *Dev* relied on by the Examiner:

Event messages sent to the user interface can utilize a filter process that is specified by the user. The user can **specify model types and a minimum event severity for which events will be displayed** on the user screen. Events from unspecified model types or less than the minimum severity will not be displayed.

*Dev*, col. 8, lines 11-14 (emphasis added). That is, the cited portion of *Dev* merely discloses that a user may establish a minimum event severity filter, below which an event will not be displayed. *Dev* fails to disclose that the user defines the severity of the event as alleged by the Examiner. For at least these reasons, it continues to be Applicant’s position that the act of “clicking on the condition red” as argued by the Examiner does not disclose, or even teach or suggest, “a user-generated text-based dialogue request specifying a user defined type of context data” recited in Claim 1. Consequently, Applicant respectfully contends that Claim 1 and each of its dependent claims (e.g., Claims 3-7 and 31-37) are in condition for allowance. For analogous reasons, Applicant further contends that Claims 9 and 11 and each of their dependent claims (e.g., Claims 13-20) are in condition for allowance.

**II. *Dev* does not disclose, teach, or suggest “a user-generated text-based dialogue request textually requesting context data for the subject system object” as recited in Claim 8.**

Claim 8 includes the limitations, “receiving, in response to the reporting of the alert condition, a user-generated text-based dialogue request textually requesting context data for the subject system object.” To reject those limitations, the Examiner points to sections of *Dev* that describe a user being able to obtain “more information” on a particular alarm included in a list of alarms displayed in Figure 10 by “click[ing] on a particular alarm in the list of alarms.” See *Dev* col. 15, lines 12-29; see also *Dev* col. 8, lines 31-37. More particularly, the Examiner argues, “since the request to obtain more information is generated by clicking on the text of the severity of ‘Condition Red,’ therefore *Dev* does teach ‘textually requests context data.’” See *Office Action*, page 15, lines 10-13. Applicants respectfully disagree. Merely because the alleged request of *Dev* may be created by clicking on the textual words “Condition Red,” does disclose that the alleged request “textually request[s] context data.” The phrase “Condition Red” does not textually request anything. Therefore, it continues to be Applicant’s position that the act of “clicking on the text of the severity of ‘Condition Red’” as argued by the Examiner does not disclose, or even teach or suggest, “receiving, in response to the reporting of the alert condition, a user-generated text-based dialogue request textually requesting context data for the subject system object” as recited in Claim 8. For analogous reasons, Applicant further contends that dependent Claim 35 is in condition for allowance.

**III. All Claims are in condition for allowance.**

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully contends that each and every claim is in condition for allowance. Moreover, Applicant respectfully contends that none of the deficiencies described above with respect to *Dev* are accounted for by any of the remaining references (*Touboul*, *Jacobs*, *Cox*, *Grace*, *Faigon*, and *Fanshier*) cited by the Examiner or by the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art.

**New Claims**

Applicant has added new Claim 37 which is fully supported by the Specification as originally filed and adds no new matter. Applicant respectfully contends that references cited by the Examiner fail to disclose, or even teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, the combination elements recited in this claim. As one example, Claim 37 depends from an allowable independent claim, as discussed above. As another example, none of the references cited by the Examiner teach, “enabling the user to specify the user defined type of context data after receiving the alert condition” as recited in Claim 37.

**No Waiver**

Applicant has merely discussed example distinctions from the references cited by the Examiner. Other distinctions may exist, and Applicant reserves the right to discuss these additional distinctions in a later Response or on Appeal, if appropriate. By not responding to additional statements made by the Examiner, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Examiner’s additional statements. The example distinctions discussed by Applicant is sufficient to overcome the Examiner’s rejections.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the Examiner is invited to contact Luke K. Pedersen, Attorney for Applicant, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6655.

The Examiner is authorized to charge the amount of **\$52.00** for the addition of one dependent claim. Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to **Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.**

Respectfully submitted,  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicant



\_\_\_\_\_  
Luke K. Pedersen  
Reg. No. 45,003

Date: 4-9-09

Correspondence Address:

at Customer No. **05073**